DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 261 EC 307 240

AUTHOR	Warlick, Ken; Olsen, Ken
TITLE	How To Conduct Alternate Assessments: Practices in Nine States.
INSTITUTION	Mid-South Regional Resource Center, Lexington, KY.
SPONS AGENCY	Special Education Programs (ED/OSERS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-04-00
NOTE	15p.
CONTRACT	H326R980003
AVAILABLE FROM	Alternative formats: Mid-South Regional Resource Center, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute, 126 Mineral Industries Building, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506-0051; Tel: 606-257-4921; Fax: 606-257-4353; Web site: http://www.idhi.uky.edu/msrrc
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Standards; *Disabilities; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; Federal Legislation; Interviews; Parent Participation; Policy Formation; *Portfolio Assessment; State Programs; *State Standards; *Student Evaluation; Surveys
IDENTIFIERS	Alternative Assessment; Individuals with Disabilities Educ Act Amend 1997; *Testing Accommodations (Disabilities)

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the new Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 1997 amendments that require states to develop alternate assessments and reviews state practices in Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, and Tennessee. These states were selected because they had either been implementing, were piloting, or had made decisions about the type of alternate assessment instrument to be used. Results of the review found that seven of the states have selected some form of portfolio as their primary assessment instrument. Most of the states using portfolios indicate that they chose the portfolio system because it afforded the opportunity to document not only student performance but also the supports provided by the school to promote student achievement. Six of the states surveyed are using parent surveys/interviews either as validation measures of student performance in portfolio entries or as evidence that skills learned in school are transferred outside the classroom to the home and community. Four states have chosen direct observation as the mode of assessment and two of these include on-demand tasks. Individualized Education Program and other record reviews are included as a part of the assessment or included in portfolios in five states. (Contains 11 references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 431 261

MID-SOUTH REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER

Helping Agencies Make a Difference

Inclusive large scale standards and assessment

IEP

How to Conduct Alternate Assessments: Practices in Nine States

Ken Warlick
Ken Olsen

April, 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This document is available in alternate formats

Mid-South Regional Resource Center
Inclusive Large Scale Standards & Assessment
Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute
University of Kentucky
126 Mineral Industries Building
Lexington, Kentucky 40506-0051
(606) 257-4921
Fax: (606) 257-4353
TTY: (606) 257-2903

EC307240

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This document was developed pursuant to cooperative agreement # H326R980003 DFDA 84.326R between the Mid-South Regional Resource Center, Interdisciplinary Human Development Institute, University of Kentucky, and the Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions experessed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Office of Special Education Programs and no endorsement by that office should be inferred.

This document is NOT copyrighted and readers are free to make copies.

The 1997 amendments to the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) require that "children with disabilities be included in general state and district-wide assessment programs, with appropriate accommodations where necessary." [612(a)(17)(A)]. The law requires that IEP teams determine how individual children will participate in large-scale assessments, what accommodations will be used for those individuals within the large-scale assessment program, and how individual students will be assessed if it is determined that they will not participate in the large scale assessment program [(614)(d)(1)(A)(v)]. Furthermore, the amendments specify that "as appropriate, the State or local educational agency: (i) develops guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments for those children who cannot participate in State and district-wide assessment programs; and (ii) develops and, beginning not later than July 1, 2000, conducts those alternate assessments" [612(a)(17)(A)(i-ii)].

ISSUES

States face significant challenges in selecting appropriate methods and formats for alternate assessment, not the least of which is having a system operational by July 1, 2000. Olsen (1998) has suggested the following issues to address as a state decides how to administer and score alternate assessments:

- Whether there will be a single measure or multiple measures and whether those would be administered at a single point in time or over time.
- How states will establish validity and reliability of its measures, given the short development time available and whether validity would be on the basis of the ultimate consequences or on the specific psychometric characteristics of the particular measures.
- How states will address the issues of feasibility and cost benefit and how feasibility will be balanced with reliability and validity.
- The extent to which teachers of students taking the alternate assessment bear an equitable work burden in comparison with teachers who have students who take the general education assessment.
- The extent to which measures used in the alternate assessment should look like and reflect the language of the measures that are used for all students (e.g. portfolios, performance tasks, other direct measures).
- How items are to be scored and the extent to which scores would be comparable to scores produced in the general assessment.
- Who will score/ record results.
- The role of the IEP in the assessment process.

GENERAL RESOURCES

There are limited resources to guide states on these issues. In an attempt to provide initial guidance to states, Ysseldyke and Olsen (1997), described four possible techniques for the "How" of alternate assessment: observation, recollection (via interview or rating scale), record review, and tests. This article was later revised and published in Exceptional Children, (Ysseldyke and Olsen, 1999). These options were used as the basis for an ongoing "Cybersurvey" conducted by the National Center on Educational Outcomes (NCEO) to analyze state activities in alternate assessments. The NCEO currently is developing some status reports based on the survey data. The survey and other NCEO documents can be accessed through http://www.http: //206.147.58.9/survey/fullsearch.html

Assessing Special Education Students (ASES). The State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) is in the process of developing an alternate assessment resource document which reviews the implications of using various options for alternate assessments. The resource document is not complete at this time and the CCSSO rules dictate that only contributing SCASS states have access to the final product. However, permission has been granted by the SCASS/ASES to share the following list of options being reviewed:

- Out-of-Level Testing
- IEP Goals and Objectives
- Partial Testing on Regular Assessment
- Modified, Adapted Regular Test
- Adaptive Behavior Scales and Other Standardized Rankings of Student Self-Sufficiency
- Bodies of Evidence and Multiple Approaches (Including Portfolios)
- Individual Classroom Tests
- Authentic Performance Tasks

- Parent Surveys

It must be noted, however, that the SCASS does not recommend all of these options.

STATE PRACTICES

In "Alternate Assessment Issues and Practices," Olsen, Bechard, Kennedy, Haigh, Parshall, and Friedebach (1998) outlined initial practices in five states across SEVEN issues, including the "How" issue. This paper goes beyond that document, focusing on the issue of how to assess and score. Specifically, this paper addresses what instruments are used and how the results are scored. The following state practice descriptions describe how Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, and Tennessee are addressing this issue. These states were selected because at the time of this writing (Summer 1998), they had either implemented, were piloting, or had made decisions about the type of alternate assessment instrument to be used.

DELAWARE

As a part of the Delaware educational reform effort, Delaware has developed academic Content Standards and Curricula Frameworks for English/ Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science defining what every Delaware student should know and be able to do. The Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) is an accountability gauge designed to improve classroom teaching and learning and to provide information to parents, students, and the public. The DSTP includes multiple choice items, open response items and performance tasks. A significant portion of the assessment is nationally normed. When fully implemented, testing will occur at grades 3, 5, 8, 10 and 11.

The Delaware Department of Education contracted with the University of Delaware's Center for Disabilities Studies to assist in the development of an assessment process for students enrolled in functional programs – those students who, even with appropriate accommodations, would not be able to participate in the Delaware Student Testing Program. Although it was felt that many of the general content Standards applied to students who are potential candidates for the alternate assessment, stakeholders also felt that students in "life skills" or "functional" programs needed to be assessed against standards that addressed what they were taught and had learned. Therefore, the Design Group developed "Standards and Key Concepts for Functional Programs" (1998). They selected fourteen of the thirty-eight academic standards (English/ Language Arts, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science) and added five additional domains including Communication, Personal Management, Social, Career/ Vocational, and Applied Academics.

Moreover, the Design Group decided, as have several other states, that the assessment process should not only assess individual student performance but should also provide an analysis of the learning opportunities provided, the supports to the student and the opportunities for generalizing skills across multiple settings. The Delaware Alternate Portfolio Assessment (DAPA) evaluates student performance at ages 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, and 20. The group determined that a student portfolio of work was the best avenue for collecting such information. Although mandatory contents of the portfolio have yet to be determined, it has been recommended that the portfolio include samplings over time of such items as:

- work samples
- a parent survey
- IEP data
- student schedules
- specification of the level of prompting
- teacher/parent/peer/self reports
- photographs
- videotaped performance events

A draft-scoring rubric has been developed. A training manual for evaluators is under development.

IDAHO

General assessments in Idaho include the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), Direct Writing Assessment (DWA) and Direct Mathematics Assessment (DMA). An Alternate Assessment Task Force has drafted standards and benchmarks and created a performance assessment targeting communication skills within the social domain and functional math skills within the vocational domain. The alternate assessments will be given at grades 4, 8, and 11 (ages 9, 13, 16). A five point scoring scale (Advanced, Proficient, Satisfactory, Developing, Minimal) will be employed to mirror the scales used with the direct writing and direct math assessments for typical students.

In order to take the alternate assessment the student must meet all of the following criteria:

- The student's demonstrated cognitive ability and adaptive behavior prevents completion of the general academic curriculum even with program modifications AND
- The student's course of study is primarily functional and living skill oriented AND
- The student is unable to acquire, maintain, generalize skills and demonstrate performance of those skills without intensive, frequent, and individualized instruction.

The assessment is a compilation (Idaho does not use the term portfolio) which includes:

- direct observation by teachers,
- videotaping student performance,
- parent validation via a rating scale that the performance samples are consistent with their observation of student work,
- a student's schedule evidencing settings,
- sample or description of student's communication system,
- a communication project, and
- a math vocational project.

Student performances will be scored independently by two or more trained evaluators at the state level. The scoring scale evaluates several areas to measure student progress and the opportunities or supports offered by the school to increase a student's achievement. Some of these include:

- Student performance (the student using problem solving, initiating responses at the appropriate time, demonstrating consistency and independence)
- Opportunities to access multiple school settings
- Opportunities for interactions with non-disabled peer, and
- Generalization of skills

INDIANA

The Indiana Assessment System of Educational Proficiencies (IASEP) draws from a variety of sources: the participatory levels from "Addressing Unique Educational Needs of Students with Disabilities", AUEN 3.0, (American Institutes for Research, 1996), the emphasis on environments from Vermont's COACH model (Giangreco, Cloninger, Iverson, 1998), the functional outcome domains from NCEO, and the alternate performance indicators from New York (University of the State of New York, 1998). The IASEP is also linked to the Indiana State Education Proficiencies and content for the areas of language arts, math, social studies, and science. In addition to these, IASEP includes proficiencies for the domains of vocational experience, social adjustment, personal adjustment, and recreation and leisure. The latter broad domains resulted from a review of numerous adaptive behavior- rating skills, reviewing curriculum guides for individuals with moderate to severe cognitive disabilities, and an analysis of the functional needs of Indiana students. Each identified domain was analyzed to determine essential skills.

The IASEP uses multiple assessment techniques over time and across environments to present a comprehensive picture of student learning. Thus the assessment utilizes observations, interviews, rating scales, record reviews, and testing. The assessment results are expected to reflect student progress toward academic proficiencies, curriculum objectives, teacher goals, and instructional needs. IASEP uses the participatory levels from AUEN to rate student performance as independent, functionally dependent, supported independent, or participant.

Indiana is piloting the assessment in seven sites during the 1998-99 school year with student performance across the domains entered by the teacher via computer three times during the academic year. The computer program contains the domains and subdomains and historical data about student performance. By allowing teachers to enter and retrieve data over time, the teachers are able to create individualize student assessments. Indiana is piloting this approach and is studying the issue of how to aggregate data from these assessments.

KENTUCKY

The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) mandated a performance based assessment system based on academic expectations for all students assessed in meaningful contexts which held schools accountable for the performance of all students. Specific instruments were designed to assess student performance in Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Writing, Arts and Humanities, and Practical Living/ Vocational Skills. In 1992, it was determined that a small number of students would require an alternate assessment. Students selected to participate in the alternate assessment are those individuals whose cognitive disabilities prevent the completion of a regular course of study even with

modifications, adaptations, and extended time and who require extensive instruction in multiple, community settings to insure skill acquisition, maintenance, and generalization to real-life contests. Current data indicate that approximately .6 percent of Kentucky's students meet the criteria to participate in the alternate assessment program.

The instrument selected for assessing eligible students is the Kentucky Alternate Portfolio. The skills assessed through the portfolio represent 28 of the 54 academic expectations identified for all students. Each of these academic expectations was analyzed to extract its "critical function" in order to develop examples of how students with significant disabilities might demonstrate the same academic expectations as all other students.

Each student's portfolio contains multiple entries, some required and some selected by the student. Secondly, the portfolio contains sufficient entries to demonstrate accurately both the skills the student has learned and the quality of supports the school has provided the student. All portfolios must document the following:

- a table of contents.
- evidence of the student's primary mode of communication e.g. pictorial systems, sign/ gestures or a combination of both.
- evidence of the student's daily/ weekly schedule clearly delineating how the student uses the schedule to initiate or monitor his or her daily activities e.g. text, picture or symbolic notations. Supportive performance data of how the student uses the schedule is also included.
- a student letter to the reviewer indicating why the student has selected the entries to be included in his or her portfolio. This letter can be written by the student, transcribed, or written in collaboration with a peer.
- Five entries with prescribed work by grade level, depicting student work relative to the academic expectations for all students. Evidence should include the student's IEP objectives instructed in heterogeneous, cooperative learning environments.
- A work resume for students in the 12th grade detailing both in-school and community-based work experiences, employer evaluations, and a job exploration entry for students in the 8th grade.
- a letter from the student's parents or guardian verifying both that they have reviewed the portfolio contents and that the entries are the student's work. The letter also affords parents the opportunity to describe how the skills learned in school are evidenced at home or in the community.

The scoring rubric for the portfolio uses standards based on what the state has determined are best practices for instructing students with moderate and severe disabilities.

- Standard 1: The student's ability to plan, perform, monitor, and evaluate his or her own performance on a targeted skill related to the academic expectations and usually included in an IEP objective.
- Standard 2: The degree of natural supports utilized such as peer buddies, tutors, or work site co-workers as opposed to instructional staff assistance, and the use of appropriate technology and adaptive assistive devices.
- Standard 3: Degree of peer relationships and mutual friendships with non-disabled peers.
- Standard 4: Application of learned skills across multiple school and community settings particularly in integrated settings.
- Standard 5: The student's opportunities to make choices and the use of age-appropriate materials.

These standards are applied to represent the students' performance against the same four performance levels used in the regular assessment system: Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished. Specific scoring criteria for these performance levels established benchmark examples representing the types of evidence that would be sufficient to obtain ratings for each performance level. A scoring manual with representative portfolios was developed and all teachers who have students with Alternate Portfolios in the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades are given a full day training on how to score their own portfolios.

Each portfolio is first rated on each of the five standards, scoring across all entries in the portfolio. The five ratings are then used to determine a final holistic score of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, or Distinguished. Scores from Alternate Portfolios are included in both the school and district accountability index calculations. The holistic score derived from the Alternate Portfolio carries an equal weight to the score of students participating in the regular assessment system derived from a combination of assessments

in Reading, Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, Writing, Arts and Humanities, and Practical Living/ Vocational Skills. These cognitive indicators combined with non-cognitive measures for all students, such as attendance, dropout and retention rates, and post-school outcomes, are used to calculate an accountability index score to determine school rewards and sanctions.

MARYLAND

The Independence Mastery Assessment Program, (IMAP) was developed as an alternate accountability assessment to the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). Participation in the IMAP is limited to those students who are not pursuing the state's general education outcomes and who require significant alterations in either the outcome itself or the indicators for measuring the outcome.

The IMAP assessments occur at the same grades (grade 3 or age 8, grade 5 or age 10, and grade 8 or age 10) as MSPAP but also includes a preschool measure (age 5) and a post high school measure (ages 17-21) as well. The assessment covers eight basic life skill activities with age specific performance indicators:

- Content Domain:
  - Personal Management
  - Community
  - Career/ Vocational
  - Recreation/ Leisure
- Skill (Enabling) Domain:
  - Decision Making
  - Behavior
  - Academics

Student performance information is gathered from portfolio entries included throughout the year and the results of two student on-demand performance tasks derived from the four content domains administered during February. After initiation of the portfolio by the teacher, the student maintains the portfolio and creates the entries to be included. Opportunity is provided for the student and teacher to reflect on the student's work and progress over time. Examples of performance events might involve planning a trip or constructing a bulletin board. There are four tasks in each of the four content areas weighted for difficulty. In addition, the 1998 set included two generic tasks. The student's teacher selects one of the performance tasks for the student from a test item bank and the district testing coordinator randomly assigns the other tasks. Both performance tasks were videotaped during the initial phase of the assessment implementation. For the 1998-1999 school year, videotaping is optional. Conversations with Maryland staff indicate that the videotaping process was popular within the context of segregated sessions but was not favored by staff instructing students in inclusive settings. A parent survey is also collected prior to the February administration of the performance tasks. The parent survey validates improvement in student performance in the same eight basic life skills areas assessed through the portfolio and performance tasks.

Portfolios contain:

- a developmental profile of the student (strengths and abilities)
- a copy of a parent survey
- report cards based on progress in meeting IEP goals
- a copy of the student's schedule and information on how the student uses it
- accommodations or assistive devices used by the student
- a description of the student's communication system
- a description of the student's behavior management system
- a copy of the IEP
- classroom video performances
- work samples
- performance event questions and student task products drawn primarily from the content domain.

Portfolios, performance tasks, and parent surveys are sent to the state for scoring and reporting. Teachers from across the state are trained and assigned to small multi-district scoring teams, which initially score all videotaped performance tasks and the student's portfolios. A second team scores randomly selected videos and portfolios. Scores are generated for student performance, school support, and parent perceptions.

Student performance is ranked as "No attempt," "Beginning," "Emerging," "Mastery," or "Advanced." The total portfolio content is evaluated as "None," "Adequate," or "Substantial" based on inclusion of student work in each of the outcome areas.

It has not yet been determined how those results will be integrated with MSPAP results.

MICHIGAN

Michigan school districts administer an annual large scale assessment in reading and math at the 4th, 7th, and 11th grade, and science writing, and social studies in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades. The state also administers a high school proficiency test for high school graduation. Parents of children with disabilities are permitted to exempt their children from the Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP). In 1997, less than half of the state's students with disabilities participated in the MEAP.

In 1987, The Michigan Office of Special Education Services contracted with Disability Research System, Inc. to design benchmarks and assessment tools for students with disabilities. It was anticipated that student performance indicators could be used to (1) improve communication between school staff and parent, (b) improve instruction, and (c) improve evaluation of student progress. This initiative, spanning seven years, has led to the development of Outcome Indicators for Special Education, Program Outcome Guides (Frey, 1991) specific to particular disability categories, and assessments for teachers to use in monitoring student progress. Michigan plans to design a single alternate assessment instrument to be used for students with the most severe cognitive disabilities.

Eligible students for the alternate assessment would be those students at the same age as 4th, 7th, and 11th graders who are classified as trainable and severely mentally impaired, autistic, multiply impaired, and physically impaired. The IEP committee must determine that the student's cognitive function is such that he or she would not be expected to progress through academics measured by the MEAP and for whom the High School Proficiency Test is not an appropriate measure of performance.

Content standards to be assessed are based on outcomes established for each of the 12 disability categories. Benchmarks have been developed identifying student performance on four possible levels: full independence, functional independence, supported independence, and participation. The anticipated alternate assessment instrument will be designed to measure levels of supported independence and participation – the two lower levels of functioning based on the standards from Addressing Unique Educational Needs of Students with Disabilities, AUEN (American Institutes for Research, 1996). To date, Michigan has selected direct observation of student performance and adaptive behavior scales for inclusion in the assessment and consideration is being given to including a review of the student's IEP as part of the process.

The content standards include:

Performance Expectations for Students Who Will Achieve Supported Independence in Major Life Roles (Moderate Impairment)

Performance Expectation 1	Complete personal care, health and fitness activities
Performance Expectation 2	Complete domestic activities in personal living environments
Performance Expectation 3	Manage personal work assignments
Performance Expectation 4	Complete activities requiring transactions in the community
Performance Expectation 5	Participate effectively in group situations
Performance Expectation 6	Manage unstructured time
Performance Expectation 7	Proceed appropriately toward the fulfillment of personal desires

Performance Expectations for Students Who Will Achieve Participation in Major Life Roles (Severely or Profoundly Impaired)

Performance Expectation 1	Engage in typical patterns of leisure and productive activities in the home and community
Performance Expectation 2	Engage in a typical pattern of interactions
Performance Expectation 3	Participate in effective communication cycles
Performance Expectation 4	Participate in personal care, health, and safety routines
Performance Expectation 5	Reach desired locations safely within familiar environments

Potential scoring rubrics are being considered to rate a student's demonstrated performance on each of the performance expectations. It is anticipated that actual assessment administration would occur in

the fall of each year and that rankings on each of the performance expectations could be combined to produce an aggregated score.

MISSOURI

The Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 established the foundation for large-scale assessment and accountability. The Act required development of performance standards defining what students in Missouri schools should know and be able to do upon graduation, the creation of curriculum frameworks to guide local districts in aligning local curriculum with the Show-Me standards, the development of a new performance based assessment system, and expanded professional development opportunities for teachers.

In 1996, the Missouri State Board of Education adopted the Show-Me standards encompassing 33 performance/process standards grouped under four broad goals and 40 knowledge standards grouped into six content areas. Moreover, in 1997 the State Board required that all students be assessed and included in the accountability process.

The performance/process standards require that Missouri students will acquire the knowledge and skills to:

- gather, analyze, and apply information and ideas,
- communicate effectively within and beyond the classroom,
- recognize and solve problems, and
- Make decisions and act as responsible members of society.

The knowledge standards address six content areas:

- communication arts
- mathematics
- science
- social studies
- fine arts, and
- health and physical education

The majority of Missouri's students with disabilities are assessed through the content area assessments of Missouri Assessment Program (MAP). The Show-Me Standards content areas are assessed through (a) multiple choice norm-referenced items linked to the Terra Nova Survey, (b) constructed response items, and (c) performance events. The various content assessments are being phased in with a plan for the comprehensive system to be in place by 2001.

Inclusion in Missouri's alternate assessment, known as MAP-A will be determined by the student's IEP team. Decisions about individual student participation in MAP-A will be based on the goals of the student's instruction. Students with disabilities whose instructional goals lead to typical work, school and life experience will take the MAP subject area assessments. Students whose instructional program is based on goals for self-care/life skills will participate in MAP-A. It is anticipated that less than 2% of all students in the state will require an alternate assessment. Participation in the alternate assessment will occur at ages 9, 13, and 17. The Show-Me Standards are the basis of the MAP-A.

The MAP-A will be a portfolio reflecting both the student's performance and the system supports received by the student. Documentation will be collected throughout the school year and submitted for scoring in June. Missouri is conducting a pilot this spring that will examine the MAP-A process and scoring. Based upon the evaluation of the MAP-A system, final state regulations will be in place for training, which is scheduled for October 1999. For the pilot, portfolio entries can include:

- the student's IEP
- videotapes of the student
- work samples
- interviews with the student or with others familiar with the student
- photos
- the student's schedule or resume
- data charts on the student's performance
- anecdotal notes
- developmental checklists
- progress reports

The system's support evaluation component will require demonstration of:

- opportunities for interactions with non-disabled peers,
- opportunity to perform skills in multiple settings,

- the student's access to adaptations, modifications, natural supports and/or assistive technology,
- student's self-evaluation and monitoring of their progress,
- use of age appropriate activities and materials, and
- Incorporation of the Show-Me performance/process standards.

The scoring criteria for the MAP-A may result in the same achievement level scores generated by the MAP: Step 1, Progressing, nearing Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced. Teachers will be trained and will qualify to score the MAP-A. The final scoring guide will be developed after the scoring of the pilot MAP-A that is scheduled for June 1999.

NORTH CAROLINA

North Carolina's general assessment system includes:

- End of grade (EOG) tests in Reading and Math (grades 3-8)
- End of course (EOC) tests in 5 content areas
- Writing tests in grades 4 and 7
- English II test
- Computer skills at 8th grade
- Competency test in Reading and Math (if student does not pass end of grade test in grades 3-8)
- Open-ended reading and math test in grades 5 and 8
- Comprehensive test in reading and math in 10th grade

Each K-8 school receives a composite score (based on EOG scores and Writing scores) compared to an expected and exemplary standard. Meeting the exemplary standard leads to financial rewards if 50% of students are at or above grade level and at least 98% of students were tested. Schools that do not meet their expected standards and have 50% of their students below grade level are considered "low performing." The lowest 25 schools are targeted by the Department of Public Instruction for Intervention. High schools receive composite scores based on test scores from the 5 EOC tests, the English II test, College Prep participation, the comprehensive Reading and Math test, and beginning 1998-1999, drop out rates and competency test scores.

North Carolina is piloting an alternate assessment portfolio in fourteen districts during the 1998-1999 school year. Eligible students are those not involved in the Standard Course of Study and not pursuing a high school diploma (projected at less than 2% of the school population). North Carolina's alternate assessment system is designed to reflect both student performance and program supports.

The contents of the Alternate Portfolio are expected to include:

- a student profile detailing student learning styles, communication styles, sensory or physical limitations, medical implications, and use of technology.
- Current and previous IEP.
- Entries representing student performance in four domains (career/ vocational, personal and home management, communication, and community). There will be minimum of at least one data entry per domain for each grading period. Entries must reflect positive learning of functional skills rather than extinction of inappropriate behaviors.
- Entries reflecting skills in self-determination, literacy, numeracy, and technology. Such entries should be evidenced across the four domains. These entries should also evidence best practices in environments that promote generalization of skills, self-determination, inclusive learning opportunities, and contextual learning.
- In the future, the portfolio will contain previous portfolio evaluation and summary sheets.

Each of the four domains is divided into sub-domains, which are further subdivided into specific competencies or performance indicators:

- Career/ Vocational Domain
  - Awareness of work
  - Physical aspects of work
  - Social aspects of work
  - Job-specific skills
  - Job-seeking skills
- Personal and Home Management Domain

Self-help
Home living
Healthful living

- Communication Domain
  Receptive communication
  Expressive communication
- Community Domain
  Accessing Community Resources while demonstrating socially responsible behavior
  Leisure/ Recreation Activities while demonstrating socially responsible behavior
  Community membership (North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, 1998)

Evidence of student performance in each domain is rated on a four-point scale. It has not yet been determined how scores will be included in state reports and accounting procedures.

TENNESSEE

The Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment System (TCAP) uses the Terra Nova for its general assessment. Content assessed covers five areas: English/ language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, and health. The Alternate Assessment Steering Committee selected a portfolio and a parent survey as the instrumentation to be used for alternate assessment TCAP-ALT. The TCAP-ALT requires the following contents in the portfolio:

- A table of contents
- A letter from a family member or caregiver
- A student letter to the reviewer
- Student's present mode of communication
- A link from the General Education Standards chosen from the alternate assessments to IEP components
- A formal resume for high school students exiting the program
- Entries from the five content areas sampled four times during the year.

A scoring rubric consists of five dimensions and five anchor points consistent with the Terra Nova (Step 1, Progressing, Nearing Proficiency, Proficient, and Advanced). Scoring of the portfolios at the state level would be comparable to grades tested by the Terra Nova, ages 7, 10, 14 and exit year. Scoring in interim years (ages 8, 9, 11, 12, and 18 if not exiting) would be conducted at the LEA level. The alternate portfolio system is being piloted in the spring of 1999.

Tennessee measures student supports as part of its evaluation. Therefore, each portfolio is rated on dimensions including context, choice, supports, settings, and interactions.

DECISIONS ON HOW COMPARISONS

Table 1 portrays the alternate assessment methods selected by the nine states surveyed. Seven of the states included in this review have selected some form of portfolio or collection of student work as their primary assessment instrument. Most of the states using portfolios indicate that they chose the portfolio system as a means of collecting student work over time, because it afforded the opportunity to document not only student performance but the supports provided by the school to promote student achievement. The specific portfolio contents are described in the next section for the six states that listed them. Six of the states surveyed are using parent surveys/ interviews either as validation measures of student performance portfolio entries or as evidence that skills learned in school are transferred outside the classroom to the home and community. Four states have chosen direct observation as the mode of assessment and two of these include on demand tasks. Videotaping of student performance is a common component of assessments using direct observation. IEP and other record reviews are included as part of the assessment or included in portfolios in five states. Four states used behavioral/ developmental checklists as a primary component of the alternate assessment. The most commonly used are skills arrays provided by Addressing Unique Educational Needs of Students with Disabilities (AUEN). None of the states were using traditional commercial adaptive behavior scales commonly used in eligibility evaluations and reevaluations. Behavioral/ developmental checklists were most common in those states that opted for alternate assessments based on a functional curriculum separate from the general standards for all students. Three states developed their alternate assessments using subsets of their state's standards for all students. These

states also developed scoring rubrics that produced scores for students using the same terminology as that used for scores in the general assessment. All of the states reviewed here have chosen to conduct alternate assessments at least at the same age as students assessed in the general assessment and several have added assessments at an early childhood transition level and or at ages past typical high school age.

TABLE 1

Alternate Assessment Instrument Method Selection by State

States	Work Samples/ Portfolios	On Demand Tasks	Parent Surveys/ Interviews	Record/ IEP Review	Direct Observation / Interviews	Behavioral/ Developmental Checklists	Adapted Test Versions
DE	X		X	X			
ID	X		X		X		
IN			X	X	X	X	
KY	X						
MD	X	X	X	X	X		
MI					X	X	
MO	X		X	X		X	X
NC	X			X			
TN	X		X				

Six states specifically indicate that they use a portfolio. The contents of their portfolios are summarized in Table 2. Portfolios commonly include work samples, parent input (via letter or survey), IEPs, a copy of a student's schedule, evidence of human and technological supports, opportunities to generalize skill application across settings, and information about the student's primary mode of communications. An empty cell in this table does not indicate that the information is precluded from a portfolio.

TABLE 2

SPECIFIED PORTFOLIO CONTENTS FOR STATES SPECIFICALLY USING PORTFOLIOS

States	DE	KY	MD	MO	NC	TN
Table of Contents	X	X				X
Work samples	X	X	X	X	X	X
Parent input	X	X	X	X		X
IEP's	X		X	X	X	X
Developmental/ behavioral checklists				X		
Student schedules	X	X	X	X		X
Supports/ prompts needed	X	X	X	X	X	X
Behavioral supports			X			
Peer input	X			X		
Photo/ video information	X		X	X		
Letter to reviewer						X
Work resume (older students)		X		X		X
Profile of strengths/ abilities			X		X	
Report cards/ data charts			X	X		
Communication mode		X	X		X	X
Performance event results			X			
Student interview data				X		
Anecdotal notes				X		
Prior portfolio evaluations					X	

The table only lists the items specifically mentioned in the states' materials. Also, Idaho is identified in Table 1 as using a portfolio-like system but is not included in Table 2. This is because Idaho

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

does not call their compilation of student work a portfolio and does not, at least at the time of this writing, specify the contents.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This analysis included the three states (Kentucky, Maryland, and Michigan) that had been working on the specific issue of alternate assessment prior to the IDEA amendments of 1997 and six other states that appeared to be ahead of most of the nation in responding to the new requirement. However, it is clear that most states are still at a very preliminary stage of development and implementation of their alternate assessment methodology.

Based on this small sample of states, one might draw at least three preliminary conclusions about the "How" of alternate assessments:

1. Collections of work over time or portfolios might be the most common method and most states are requiring specific contents in those portfolios,
2. Parent interviews, surveys, or verification letters are essential components of many state systems, and
3. While most alternate assessment systems are loosely based on the general assessment system in terms of ages tested and rubrics used, few states have worked out the details of reporting and using alternate assessment data in state accountability systems.

Alternate Assessment Contacts:

Delaware—Martha Toomey mtoomey@state.de.us
Idaho—Jean Taylor jtaylor@sde.state.id.us
Indiana—Deborah Bennett bennett@purdue.edu
Kentucky—Mike Burdge mburdge@ihdi.uky.edu
Maryland—John Haigh jhaigh@msde.state..md.us
Michigan—Peggy Dutcher pdutcher@ed.mde.state.mi.us
Minnesota—Mike Trepanier mike.trepanier@state.mn.us
Missouri—Melodie Friedebach mfriedebach@mail.dese.state.mo.us
North Carolina—David Mills dmills@mail.dpi.state.nc.us
Tennessee—Ann Sanders asanders@mail.state.tn.us

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES:

American Institutes for Research (1996). "Assessing Unique Educational Needs of Students with Disabilities". Palo Alto, CA.

Delaware Department of Education (1998). "Standards and Key Concepts for Functional Programs".

Frey, W.D. (1991). "Outcome Indicators for Special Education: A Model for Studying the Expected Outcomes of Education for Students with Disabilities". East Lansing, MI: Center for Quality Special Education, Disability Research Systems, Inc.

Giangreco, M., Cloninger, C., and Iverson, V. (1998). "Choosing Outcomes and Accommodations for Children (COACH). A guide to Educational Planning for Students with Disabilities", Second edition. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks.

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997. (1997). 20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.

North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (1998). "North Carolina Portfolio Assessment for Students with Disabilities: Pilot Site Guide". Raleigh, NC.

Olsen, K. (1998). "Introduction and Issues". Alternate Assessment: Issues and Practices. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky, Mid-South Regional Resource Center.

Olsen, Bichard, Kennedy, Haigh, Parshall and Friedeback (1998). Alternate Assessment: Issues and Practices. Lexington, KY: University of Kentucky, Mid-South Regional Resource Center.

University of the State of New York (1998). "The Learning Standards and Alternate Performance Indicators for Students with Severe Disabilities".

Ysseldyke, J.E. and Olsen, K. (1997). "Putting Alternative Assessments into Practice: Possible Sources of Data". Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes.

Ysseldyke, J.E., and Olsen, K. (1997). "Putting Alternative Assessment into Practice: What to Measure and Possible Sources of Data". Exceptional Children, 65(2), 175-185.